

Response ID ANON-7TG7-FA79-Z

Submitted to **LDP2 - Main Issues Report**

Submitted on **2019-01-30 18:12:08**

Data protection

About you

Are you responding as an: individual, organisation, or an agent acting on behalf of a client?

██████████

Individual

What is your name?

Individual name:

████████████████████

What is your address?

Address line 1:

██████████

Address line 2 :

Address line 3:

Town/City:

██████████

Post code:

██████████

What is your contact number?

Individual Phone No:

██████████████████

What is your email address?

Individual email:

██

Vision aims and spatial strategy

Question 1

Q1 Agree aims LDP2:

We are broadly supportive of the aims described in the LDP2MIR, and in particular 'promoting development of Brown Field sites', a subject which is particularly relevant in the context of the Vacant and Derelict Land Taskforce which is being led by SEPA and the Scottish Land Commission.

Transforming Vacant and Derelict Land

There is nearly 12,000 hectares of vacant and derelict land in Scotland which is the equivalent to over 9,000 football pitches. It is estimated that a third of us live within 500 metres of a derelict site. In some of Scotland's cities this figure is much higher, reaching 61% in Glasgow.

The Scottish Land Commission and the Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) are working together in an innovative partnership to transform how vacant and derelict land is dealt with. Supporting local authorities to rejuvenate vacant and derelict land brings about long term regeneration and renewal – unlocking growth, reviving communities, increasing community empowerment, reducing inequalities and inspiring local pride and activities.

The Land Commission and SEPA have signed a Sustainable Growth Agreement and will use this agreement to focus on the delivery of our shared vision for transforming our approach to vacant and derelict land in Scotland.

We are also supportive of the planning authority's aims of 'Protecting the Natural Environment', and Encouraging Tourism and a better visitor economy.

We think Policy EP7 , respecting Listed Buildings should also be a priority,

Growing our economy

Question 2

Q2:

Q2 upload:

No file was uploaded

Question 3

Settlement business allocated:

There are still several 'brownfield sites' which have not been utilised in Hawick, namely zEL49 , zEL62, zEL50 zEL60, zEL48 MHAW1001 (form the existing Local Development Plan). Many of which can be classified as derelict or vacant at present see Q 1 above

The proposed site BHAW1004, is not a 'brownfield' site and its development would interfere with the B listed 'tower' of Burnhead. Burnhead House along with the adjoining 'Tower' have been in the Scott family since the 1400's and the current owner would like to ensure the historic setting of this locally important building is not lost. Developing the site at BHAW1004 would, in our opinion, adversely affect the setting of a Listed Building which is contrary to Policy EP7 of the current Local Development Plan relating to the protection of listed buildings. Additionally, Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) also notes "protecting, enhancing and promoting access to cultural heritage, including the historic environment" should be a guiding principle for policies and decisions. SPP also states that the planning system should:

- promote the care and protection of the designated and non-designated historic environment (including individual assets, related settings and the wider cultural landscape) and its contribution to sense of place, cultural identity, social well-being, economic growth, civic participation and lifelong learning

It goes on, with specific regard to listed buildings, to state "the layout, design, materials, scale, siting and use of any development which will affect a listed building or its setting should be appropriate to the character and appearance of the listed building". We do not consider the allocation will fit all these requirements. Furthermore, the land in question is currently tenanted by a local farmer, removing this arable land would make economies of scale less possible (110 ha to 100 ha = 10% area lost), which would in turn compromise their ability to care for the environment. At paragraph 4.11 your proposals rightly suggest more weight should be given to economic development benefits within planning policy within LDP2 for new businesses, leisure and tourism in the countryside. This should not be at the expense of existing small-scale agricultural businesses which have been the bedrock of the region's economy for generations.

Upload Q3:

No file was uploaded

Question 4

Business Use Towns:

Upload Q4:

No file was uploaded

Question 5

Land delivery effectively:

Brown field sites should be a priority for Business and Industry development. Rejuvenating many of the derelict buildings in Hawick should be made a priority, to improve the appearance and attractiveness of Hawick for both the locals and tourists.

Business and Industrial land should not be situated at the town entrance as it reduces the town's attractiveness, and Hawick at present is working very hard to improve its attractiveness to visitors to increase tourism. Something which is distinctly lacking in Hawick at present

Particularly in Hawick, we need to develop vacant and derelict land to enhance the attractiveness of Hawick centre, where the A7 runs though.

Care should be taken to prevent Historic sites from being affected

Question 6

Agree?:

We do not agree the development of BHAW1004

Several reasons not to develop BHAW1004

- Contrary to Policy EP7 Listed Buildings. This site is adjacent to a Listed tower, adjoining a historic family home
- Drainage from development would compromise the adjacent natural environment, namely the 'Glen' which is identified as a 'herb rich pasture'
- Industrial/Business development at the town entrance would not be attractive, and the buildings would spoil the current fabulous view from the A7 on the approach to Hawick, of Ruberslaw and beyond. Development on this site would spoil the current first impressions of Hawick to tourists.
- Taking farmland from a new young farmer(10% of the arable area, would be detrimental to growth of this established business). Indeed it would reduce the size of the farm and the economies of scale, making the business less profitable.

Further food production for a growing population should not be underestimated. Prime arable ground should not be used for development

Many of the existing sites e.g. zEL49 , zEL62, zEL50 zEL60, zEL48 and MHAW1001 have still to be developed and rejuvenated first.

Upload Q6:

No file was uploaded

Planning for housing

Question 7

Housing agree?:

We do not agree with the preferred options for housing sites, namely AHAW1027 for the following reasons

- It is beside a council Estate , and would end up being an extension of this already unattractive Estate , and exaggerate the problems that go with this type of Estate.
 - It is part of an existing wetland. Removal of this wetland would be contrary to the current sustainability of protecting the natural environment
 - The land has been in the same family since 1400's , and the area has already been depleted in size over the years due to encroachment from the town. Removal of this land would potentially destroy this historic family home
- This is Prime arable ground which should be preserved for food production and biodiversity

Upload Q7:

No file was uploaded

Question 8**Housing countryside:****Upload Q8:**

No file was uploaded

Question 9**Agree removed housing :**

Please remove AHAW1007 for reasons as in Q7

Supporting our town centres**Question 10****Core Activity Areas:****Question 11****Berwickshire supermarket:****Upload Q11:**

No file was uploaded

Question 12**Develp contrib town:****Delivering sustainability and climate change agenda****Question 13****Support alternative option:****Question 14****National park:**

National Park

Excellent idea, A Long and narrow Park, taking rivers and landmarks into account , but not restricting development which might encourage tourists into the area. E.g. upmarket chalets , and outdoor activities, as found in other national Parks.

Upload Q14:

No file was uploaded

Regeneration**Question 15****Agree redevelopment:****Upload Q15:**

No file was uploaded

Settlement Map

Question 16

Oxnam settlement:

Question 17

Core frontage Newcastleton:

Planning policy issues

Question 18

Agree amendments appendix3:

Any other comments

Question 19

Other main issues:

Landowner details

Have you submitted any site suggestions in this consultation?

No

If yes, please confirm the site and provide the landowner details (if known) for each site you have suggested.: